<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 8, 2007. Claims 14-28 are presented for examination, of which Claims 14, 19 and 24 are in independent form. Claims 1-13 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 14-28 have been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The specification has been amended to conform the Summary of Invention section to the amended claims.

The title has been amended to make it more descriptive, as required in the Office Action.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 on the ground that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter; Claims 1-13 were provisionally rejected over Claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 7,228,314; Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,218,976 (Minagawa); and Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,975,417 (Hilpl).

Cancellation of Claims 1-13 renders their rejections moot, but Applicant submits the following comments regarding the patentability of new Claims 14-28 over these cited references.

Claim 14 is directed to an information processing apparatus including: (1) an extraction unit configured to extract a conflict resolution rule from the head of a queue; (2) a determination unit configured to determine whether or not a predetermined control symbol is

10

included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by the extraction unit, wherein the control symbol indicates information on priority of application of the conflict resolution rule over other rules; and (3) a processing unit configured to, if it is determined by the determination unit that the control symbol is included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by the extraction unit, remove the control symbol from the conflict resolution rule and insert the conflict resolution rule from which the control symbol is removed into the end of the queue, and if it is determined by the determination unit that the control symbol is not included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by the extraction unit, evaluate the conflict resolution rule extracted by the extraction unit.

Among other notable features of Claim 14 is a processing unit configured to, if it is determined by the determination unit that the control symbol is included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by the extraction unit, remove the control symbol from the conflict resolution rule and insert the conflict resolution rule from which the control symbol is removed into the end of the queue, and if it is determined by the determination unit that the control symbol is not included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by the extraction unit, evaluate the conflict resolution rule extracted by the extraction unit.

U.S. Patent No. 7,228,314 recites, among other things, a method for setting print options using a print control apparatus having a memory configured to store a plurality of conflict process rules generated by a conflict process rule generation apparatus for generating conflict process rules that define conditions for avoiding a conflict between settings related to printing. The conflict process rule generation apparatus described in U.S. Patent No. 7,228,314 includes a memory for storing a principal rule that corresponds to a part of the conflict process rules and an

11

inference engine configured to generate a complementary rule that corresponds to the rest of the conflict process rules based on the principal rule, and to write the complimentary rule in the memory. However, nothing in U.S. Patent No. 7,228,314 teaches or suggests at least "a processing unit configured to, if it is determined by said determination unit that the control symbol is included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by said extraction unit, remove the control symbol from the conflict resolution rule and insert the conflict resolution rule from which the control symbol is removed into the end of the queue, and if it is determined by said determination unit that the control symbol is not included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by said extraction unit, evaluate the conflict resolution rule extracted by said extraction unit," as recited in Claim 14.

Minagawa relates to a user interface control apparatus for resolving a conflict between a plurality of pieces of setup information input to a predetermined apparatus to be controlled via a user interface and/or a plurality of pieces of environment information of the apparatus to be controlled. Minagawa discusses a holding means for holding conflict resolution rules to be applied in accordance with at least one of the setup information and the environment information; status control means for controlling to enable/disable a direct change in state of a predetermined setup item on the user interface in accordance with the conflict resolution rules; and message control means for sending a message including a reason why the direct change in state of the predetermined setup item is disabled by the status control means via the user interface. Minagawa further discusses that the conflict resolution rules include a command for disabling the direct change in state of the predetermined setup item and reason information indicating a reason why the direct change is disabled by the command. However, Minagawa

12

does not teach or suggest "a processing unit configured to, if it is determined by said determination unit that the control symbol is included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by said extraction unit, remove the control symbol from the conflict resolution rule and insert the conflict resolution rule from which the control symbol is removed into the end of the queue, and if it is determined by said determination unit that the control symbol is not included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by said extraction unit, evaluate the conflict resolution rule extracted by said extraction unit," as recited in Claim 14.

Hilpl relates to method of programming user defined conflicts that would not otherwise be able to be identified as conflicts based on priori information. The method includes initiating a saved conflict mode and saving a user defined conflict by either storing print job attributes in a conflict list while in the save conflict mode or storing at least one of a policy, a capability and a constraint based on the print job attributes while in the save conflict mode. However, Applicant has found nothing in Hilpl that would teach or suggest "a processing unit configured to, if it is determined by said determination unit that the control symbol is included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by said extraction unit, remove the control symbol from the conflict resolution rule and insert the conflict resolution rule from which the control symbol is removed into the end of the queue, and if it is determined by said determination unit that the control symbol is not included in the conflict resolution rule extracted by said extraction unit, evaluate the conflict resolution rule extracted by said extraction unit," as recited in Claim 14.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 14 is allowable over the cited prior art.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference

against Claim 14.

Independent Claims 19 and 24 are method and program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 14, and are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 14.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200